

I was surprised and shocked to hear of Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election.

This is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

I thought that Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. Is this correct? When large companies control the airwaves, it appears that we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. There should be some accountability to all of us. Thank you.